DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 145 517 EA 009 980

AUTHOR	Cunningham, Claude H.; Williams, Frank P.
TITLE	Magnet School Project Evaluation First Annual Report, 1975-76.
INSTITUTION	Houston Independent School District, Tex.
PUB DATE	76
NOTE	31p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Alternative Schools; Educational Alternatives; Elementary Secondary Education; Enrollment; *Integration Methods; *Program Evaluation; *Racial Distribution; School Integration; *Student Transportation; Tables (Data)
IDENTIFIERS	Houston Independent School District TX; *Magnet Schools

ABSTRACT

The Magnet School Plan as presented to the court and subsequently approved in July, 1975, contained four action areas: (1) reduce the number of schools that are 90 percent or more white or combined black and brown, (2) reduce the number of students attending schools that are 90 percent or more white or combined black and brown, (3) provide free transportation to all students attending magnet schools, and (4) report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each magnet school biannually. These action concerns have been translated into 34 programs operating in 32 schools as either schools-within-schools, add-on programs, cluster centers, or separate and unique schools. This comprehensive report contains evaluation of the degree that each program has met its objectives and of the degree that the total project has met the objectives for integration as approved by the court. The Phase I programs were able to achieve 81.5 percent of their 232 objectives. Four general problems were reported--curriculum development, transportation, recruitment, and purchase of materials. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED145517

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Claude H. Cunningham

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

Magnet School Project Evaluation

First Annual Report

1975-76

Program Planning, Research and Evaluation

Claude H. Cunningham, Research Associate
Frank P. Williams, Research Assistant

Houston Independent School District
3830 Richmond Avenue
Houston, Texas 77027

EA 009 980

MEMORANDUM

Houston Independent School District

August 12, 1976

AM PM

To: Dr. John Codwell
Superintendent for Instruction

From: Program Planning, Research and Evaluation

Re: Final Evaluation Report of the Magnet Schools Program
1975-76

The attached final evaluation report is submitted for your approval. The suggested distribution list is as follows:

Mr. Billy R. Reagan
Mr. Linus Wright
Mr. Joseph Angle
Mr. Gordon Cotton
Dr. Gonzalo Garza
Mrs. Patricia Shell
Dr. John Brandstetter

Claude H. Cunningham
Research Associate

Frank Williams
Research Assistant

APPROVED:

Michael W. Say
Associate Superintendent

APPROVED:

John E. Codwell
Superintendent for Instruction

MEMORANDUM

June 24, 1976

To: Dr. John Codwell
Superintendent for Instruction

From: Program Planning, Research and Evaluation

Re: Executive Summary of Magnet School Project Evaluation - First Annual Report

The attached Magnet School Project Evaluation addresses four action steps defined by the U.S. District Court decree of July 11, 1975, under which the Magnet School project was implemented. In addition, the report summarizes the accomplishment of instructional objectives and problems faced by Phase I Magnet School programs. The following statements summarize the Magnet School project during 1975-1976.

1. Number of Ethnically Isolated Schools Reduced

   Twelve fewer schools were reported as ethnically isolated in April, 1976, than in October, 1974.

2. Number of Students Attending Ethnically Isolated Schools Reduced

   The percentage of students attending ethnically isolated schools was reduced by 4.5% from 54.7% in October, 1974, to 50.2% in April, 1976.

3. Transportation Provided for Magnet School Students

   A total of 2,503 students received free transportation to Magnet Schools. This represented 89.6% of the 2,795 interschool Magnet School transfer students.

4. Goals Approved for Student Enrollment and Teacher Assignment by Ethnic Group

   The overall ethnic makeup of the Magnet School student population was 37.4% Black, 27.3% Mexican-American, 35.3% Other.

   Of the 285 teachers and instructional coordinators in the Magnet School project, 30.2% were Black, 11.6% were Mexican-American, and 58.2% were classified as Other.

5. Instructional Objectives of Magnet Schools Accomplished

   The 34 Phase I Magnet School programs accomplished 189 of 232 proposed objectives, or 81.5% of the total number of objectives.

6. General Problems in Phase I Magnet School Project Experienced

Four general problems were reported by Phase I Magnet School programs: support for curriculum development, transportation, recruitment, and approval and receipt of materials. These problems have been reported during the year and action to correct the problems has been reported.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	4
EVALUATION	8
Table I. Number of Racially Isolated Schools, 1974-75	9
Table II. Number of Racially Isolated Schools, April 1976	9
Table III. Number of Racially Isolated White and Combined Black/Brown, April 1976	10
Table IV. Number and Percent of Students Attending Racially Isolated Schools, 1974-75	11
Table V. Number and Percent of Students Attending Racially Isolated Schools, April 1976	12
Table VI. Number and Percent, by Ethnic Group, of Elementary Magnet School Students	13
Table VII. Number and Percent, by Ethnic Group, of Junior High Magnet School Students	14
Table VIII. Number and Percent, by Ethnic Group, of Senior High Magnet School Students	15
Table IX. Number and Percent, by Ethnic Group, of Participants in Cluster Center Programs	15
Table X. Number and Percent, by Ethnic Group, of Student Participants in Magnet Schools	16
Table XI. Final Student Enrollment, by Magnet School	17
Table XII. Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff, Elementary Magnet Schools	19
Table XIII. Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff, Junior High Magnet Schools	19
Table XIV. Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff, Senior High Magnet Schools	20
Table XV. Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff, Magnet School Cluster Centers	20
Table XVI. Number of Objectives and Met by Each Magnet School Program	22
Table XVII. Number and Percent of Objectives Proposed and Achieved, by Magnet School Program Level	24
SUMMARY	27

INTRODUCTION

The HISD Magnet School Plan Phase I was formally implemented with the beginning of the 1975-76 school year in compliance with the Amended Decree of September 18, 1970, by the United States District Court for the Southern District of Texas, Houston Division. This action, designated Civil Action No. 10444 and dated July 11, 1975, provided for the depairing of the elementary schools ordered paired by the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, the restoration of the paired schools' original equidistant zone lines, and the implementation of the Magnet School Plan.

The Houston Independent School District (HISD) began school integration in the fall of 1960 when it implemented a grade per year transfer plan. Subsequently, the District has engaged in other methods to achieve integration; i.e., freedom of choice (1967), school pairing (1971), and the Singleton ratio (1970). None of these methods achieved the desired results.

When the twenty-two schools in the Houston Independent School District were paired in September of 1971, the enrollment in the twenty-two paired schools was 16,733. By 1975, the enrollment in the twenty-two schools was 15,419. The enrollment in the total District at the time of pairing was 231,922. The enrollment of students in Houston schools as of February 1, 1975, was 210,117.

The drop in enrollment of paired schools and the total District reflected a drop in population of families with school age children. In order to curb "flight" and attract new families to Houston, it was imperative that quality educational opportunities be designed.

The pairing of schools affected 9,957 Black students, 4,923 Brown students, and 539 White students. Mexican-American or Brown students in 1970 were counted as "White." This classification implied that minority students were paired with majority students. In reality, minority students (Black) were paired with minority students (Brown). In paired schools where White students were in attendance, there was an exodus of some Whites resulting in Black schools being paired with other Black schools. For

example, in Frost Elementary, there were initially 375 White students in attendance in 1970. The total number of White students in Frost Elementary and its paired school, Rhoads Elementary, became twenty-two. The pairing of schools hardly promoted integration.

On November 25, 1974, the Houston Independent School District Board of Trustees authorized a Task Force to develop an approach to bring about quality integrated education and review alternatives to pairing. The General Superintendent appointed 21 members (seven Blacks, eight Browns, and six Whites) to the Task Force. Extensive public hearings were conducted before the District Court's Bi-racial Committee and the Board of Trustees of the Houston Independent School District. Interested parties were given full opportunity to be heard at each of these meetings. The Task Force also visited school sites in many cities of similar size with similar problems and also relied heavily on a comprehensive needs assessment recently completed by the District. The resulting action of this Task Force was the development of a Magnet School Plan which would provide quality integrated education while reducing the burdens on the predominately minority families in the paired schools.

The Magnet School Plan as presented to the Court and subsequently approved in July, 1975, contained four action statements summarized as follows:

1. Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more white or combined black and brown.
2. Reduce the number of students attending schools which are 90% or more white or combined black and brown.
3. Provide free transportation to all students attending Magnet Schools.
4. Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

These action statements, translated into the Magnet School Project, have resulted in thirty-four programs operating in thirty-two schools. Each of

these programs was selected and developed by a building principal and his faculty. Goals, objectives, and curriculum were written and students were recruited for the first classes which began in September, 1975. Each Magnet School program was unique even though a similar magnet program operated in some other school in the District. It was the intent that the Magnet School programs would be so interesting and challenging that they would, like a magnet, attract students of all ethnic groups resulting, voluntarily, in a successful degree of integration.

Four types of Magnet School Programs were established:

1. School Within a School - a program in which a specific group of students met separate and apart from the rest of the student body for special emphasis classes, but met with the regular student body for classes not directly related to their emphasis.

2. Add On Programs - programs "added" to the regular school curriculum which involved the total enrollment of the school.

3. Cluster Centers - programs providing educational experiences for children in non-integrated environments throughout the District to which students were transported for brief periods of instruction.

4. Separate and Unique Schools - a program in which the curriculum in an entire school was changed to meet student needs.

Of the thirty-four programs, seventeen (9 elementary, 3 junior high, and 5 high school) were designated "School Within a School," eight (1 high school and 7 elementary) were designated "Add On Programs," four (2 elementary and 2 high school) were designated "Separate and Unique Schools," and five (elementary) were designated as "Cluster Centers." It was the intent of each program to enroll students according to the court-approved ethnic balance of 40% Black, 20% Brown, and 40% White. The faculty was selected on the basis of their particular talents, skills, and interests.

Program development and evaluation this year were the results of three separate but related efforts. The individual school performed its own internal evaluation. An outside agency, CREED (Corporation for Research

and Engineering in Education), was contracted by HISD to do individual program auditing, on-site monitoring, and staff assistance. The annual report was done by HISD assigned staff of the Department of Program Planning, Research and Evaluation.

This comprehensive report contains not only the evaluation of the degree that each program has met its objectives, but also an evaluation of the degree that the total Magnet School Project has met the objectives for integration as approved by the court.

EVALUATION

The evaluation of the Magnet School project was carried out in three distinct phases. Each program conducted an internal evaluation based on the specific objectives of the program. This internal evaluation was audited by an external consulting firm, Corporation for Research and Engineering in Education (CREED). CREED provided the District with two formative audit reports and one summative audit report. Since the specific program objectives included in the internal evaluations and verified by the external audit did not directly address the action statements defined by the District Court (see Introduction), an overall project evaluation addressing these action steps was undertaken. The following section is the report of this project evaluation.

Much of the data upon which this project evaluation report is based were taken from the internal evaluation reports prepared by the individual magnet programs and the audit reports prepared by CREED. Taken singly, the objectives reported in these source documents only tangentially addressed the District Court-defined action steps. The summation across programs of specific objectives allowed for determinations to be made relating to the degree to which the Magnet School project was successful in implementing the four court-defined action steps. In order to facilitate decision making based on this report, each of the four court-defined action steps was addressed individually, whether process or product, with all data summarized in a single section of the report.

The first action step delineated in the District Court decree of July 11, 1976, may be summarized in the following manner:

> Reduce the number of schools which are 90% or more white or combined black and brown.

A total of 121 schools were considered racially isolated (90% or more white or combined black and brown) under the school pairing plan in effect in 1974-75. The number of schools in each of the three school levels (elementary, junior high, senior high) which were reported as racially isolated in the 1974-75 H.E.W. School Campus Report prepared by the Pupil Accounting Department is presented in Table I.

Table I

Number and Percent of Racially Isolated Schools

By School Level, 1974-75

	Total Schools	Racially Isolated Schools	Percent Racially Isolated
Elementary	170	89	52.4%
Junior High	36*	18	50.0%
Senior High	23*	14	60.9%
TOTAL	229	121	52.8%

*Combination junior/senior high schools counted in both classifications

Under the pairing plan in effect during the 1974-75 school year, over one-half (52.8%) of the 229 regular enrollment schools in the Houston Independent School District had student enrollments which were racially isolated according to the July 1975 District Court definition. This high percentage of racially isolated schools pointed clearly to the ineffectiveness of school pairing in achieving racial desegregation. It is interesting to note that 60.9% of the senior high schools in the District were racially isolated according to the District Court definition. Also, at no school level were fewer than 50% of the schools racially isolated according to the District Court's definition.

The number of racially isolated schools in the Houston Independent School District by school level, reported in April 1976 school campus data prepared by the Pupil Accounting Department, is presented in Table II.

Table II

Number and Percent of Racially Isolated Schools

By School Level, April 1976

	Total Schools	Racially Isolated Schools	Percent Racially Isolated
Elementary	169	80	47.3%
Junior High	36*	16	44.4%
Senior High	23*	13	56.5%
TOTAL	228	109	47.8%

*Combination junior/senior high schools counted in both classifications

In April 1976, under the Magnet School Plan, 109 schools remained racially isolated. This represents a reduction of 12 racially isolated schools. The Magnet School Plan had its greatest impact at the elementary school level as evidenced by the fact that 75% of the reduction in the number of racially isolated schools was at the elementary school level. Significantly, the reduction in racially isolated schools was such that by April 1976, fewer than one-half (47.8%) of the 228 schools in the Houston Independent School District had student enrollments which were racially isolated according to the July 1975 District Court definition.

Of the 109 racially isolated schools identified in April 1976, 18 had enrollments that were 90% or more white, and 91 had enrollments that were 90% or more combined black and brown. The number of racially isolated white and combined black and brown schools, by school level, is presented in Table III.

Table III

Number of Racially Isolated White and Combined Black/Brown Schools,

By School Level, April 1976

	White	Black & Brown
Elementary	12	68
Junior High*	1	15
Senior High**	5	8
TOTAL	18	91

*Includes grades 7 - 9 at two junior/senior high schools

**Includes grades 10 - 12 at three junior/senior high schools

Of the 80 racially isolated elementary schools, 8 (10%) have Magnet School programs. Seven of these schools have combined black and brown enrollments, and one has an enrollment of 90% or more white. Two racially isolated junior high schools (12.5%) have Magnet School programs (one is a junior/senior high school) and both are 90% or more combined black and brown. Three of the 13 racially isolated senior high schools (23%) have

Magnet School programs (one is a junior/senior high school). Two of these three schools are 90% or more combined black and brown and one is 90% or more white. It is evident that 12 Magnet School programs are located on campuses which are racially isolated. These 12 Magnet School programs should probably receive additional support in recruiting for the 1976-77 school year so that they might be able to move out of "racially isolated" classification.

The second action step delineated in the District Court decree of July 11, 1976, may be summarized in the following manner:

> Reduce the number of students attending schools which 90% or more white or combined black and brown.

A total of 114,143 students (54.7% of the total enrollment) were in attendance in racially isolated schools in 1974-75 under the school pairing plan. The number of students attending racially isolated schools at each school level (elementary, junior high, senior high) is presented in Table IV.

Table IV

Number and Percent of Students Attending Racially Isolated Schools By School Level, 1974-75

	Total Enrollment	Enrollment in Racially Isolated Schools	Percent in Racially Isolated Schools
Elementary	118,550	68,247	57.6%
Junior High*	51,947	24,065	46.3%
Senior High**	38,346	21,831	56.9%
TOTAL	208,843	114,143	54.7%

*Includes grades 7 - 9 of junior/senior high schools
**Includes grades 10 - 12 of junior/senior high schools

The data presented in Table IV, taken from the H.E.W. School Campus Report prepared by the Pupil Accounting Department in 1974-75, indicate that over one-half (54.7%) of the Houston Independent School District student population attended racially isolated schools on the date the report was prepared. Only at the junior high school level did less than half (46.3%) of the students attend racially isolated schools.

The number of Houston Independent School District students attending racially isolated schools in April 1976 is reported in Table V.

Table V

Number and Percent of Students Attending Racially Isolated Schools
By School Level, April 1976

	Total Enrollment	Enrollment in Racially Isolated Schools	Percent in Racially Isolated Schools
Elementary	117,979	62,094	52.6%
Junior High*	50,507	20,611	40.8%
Senior High**	33,650	18,780	55.8%
TOTAL	202,136	101,485	50.2%

*Includes grades 7 - 9 of junior/senior high schools
**Includes grades 10 - 12 of junior/senior high schools

Data presented in Table V indicate that a reduction of 4.5% (54.7% to 50.2%) in the number of students attending schools in racially isolated settings occurred from the 1974-75 school year to April 1976. This reduction was not found to be statistically significant at the p=0.05 level.

While a net drop in both number and percent of students attending racially isolated schools has occurred, slightly more than one-half the students in the Houston Independent School District (50.2%) still attend racially isolated schools. The reduction in both number and percent of students attending racially isolated schools indicates that the Magnet School Project is more effective as an integration strategy than was the pairing plan which it replaced.

The third action step decreed by the District Court may be summarized in the following manner:

"Provide free transportation to all students attending Magnet Schools."

The massive task of transporting students from all points across the District to the Magnet Schools of their choice began with serious difficulties. As a result, some students dropped out of the program. The effort improved and the relatively small number of complaints lodged by the

schools against transportation were primarily personnel problems involving individual bus drivers. Also, some schools reported a need for additional stops along bus routes to pick up small children.

The Transportation Department began the year with 357 transportation units (buses) in operation. Seventy-six additional passenger buses were placed in operation during the period of October to December, 1975, bringing the total number of buses in service to 433. One hundred additional new buses will be placed in operation in September 1976, allowing for transportation of more than 8,500 students in 1976-77.

Three thousand three hundred thirty-six (3,336) students were designated as Magnet School transfer students. Of this number, 541 students were "intraschool" transfers and 2,795 students were "interschool" transfers. Of these interschool transfers, 2,503 (or 89.6%) received free transportation. The students who did not use the free transportation available to them used either public buses, private buses, or their own personal transportation. There have been no recent complaints that free transportation is not available to any Magnet student.

Student enrollment in Magnet Schools may be summarized in the four school categories represented in the Magnet School project. Such a summary is beneficial in that it indicates the success of the various school categories in moving their enrollments toward the District's approximately 40-40-20 ethnic ratio. Elementary Magnet Schools reported enrollments totaling 5,637 students in their internal evaluation reports. The ethnic makeup of the total elementary Magnet School student enrollment is presented in Table VI.

Table VI

Number and Percent

By Ethnic Group of Elementary Magnet School Students

	Number	Percent
Black	2,286	40.6%
Mexican-American	1,848	32.7%
Other	1,503	26.7%
TOTAL	5,637	100.0%

The data presented in Table VI indicate that elementary Magnet Schools met fair success in establishing a tri-ethnic student enrollment. Students in "Other" category fell about 10% below the desired enrollment levels. Mexican-American student enrollment was about 10% above the level projected, balancing the shortage of "Other" students. The ethnic makeup of elementary Magnet Schools was tri-ethnic and more nearly ethnically balanced than the District as a whole.

The ethnic makeup of student enrollment in junior high level Magnet Schools is presented in Table VII.

Table VII

Number and Percent,
By Ethnic Group, of Junior High Magnet School Students

	Number	Percent
Black	256	36.9%
Mexican-American	92	13.3%
Other	346	49.8%
TOTAL	694	100.0%

The data presented in Table VII indicate that junior high level Magnet Schools were less successful than elementary Magnet Schools in establishing tri-ethnic student enrollment. All junior high Magnet Schools were Vanguard programs. The limited scope of programs is evident in both the low total enrollment (only 694) and the ethnic imbalance (nearly 50% "Other" students). Additional junior high level programs in other academic areas are planned for Phase II of the Magnet School project. Such an expansion should result in higher and better balanced student enrollments.

Senior high Magnet Schools reported student enrollments totaling 1,931. The ethnic makeup of senior high Magnet School student enrollment is presented in Table VIII.

Table VIII

Number and Percent,
By Ethnic Group, of Senior High Magnet School Students

	Number	Percent
Black	567	29.4%
Mexican-American	529	27.4%
Other	835	43.2%
TOTAL	1,931	100.0%

The data presented in Table VIII indicate that senior senior high level Magnet Schools were fairly successful in establishing tri-ethnic student enrollment. Most (five of seven) senior high Magnet School programs were very small; i.e., enrollment of fewer than 100 students. Two programs, Reagan Fundamental School and Contemporary Learning Center, reported enrollments which totaled 1,671 or 86.5% of the total senior high level Magnet School student enrollment. The five smaller programs reported that recruitment for 1976-77 is going well and should result in student enrollments more nearly reflective of the District's ethnic makeup.

The majority of students served by Magnet School programs participated in elementary Cluster Center programs. The five Cluster Centers reported participation by 23, 491 students from ethnically imbalanced schools. The ethnic makeupof Cluster-Center participants is presented in Table IX.

Table IX

Number and Percent,
By Ethnic Group, of Participants in Cluster Center Programs

	Number	Percent
Black	8,752	37.3%
Mexican-American	6,203	26.4%
Other	8,536	36.3%
TOTAL	23,491	100.0%

Data presented in Table IX indicates that74% of the 31,753 Magnet School project student participants were reported by the five Cluster Center programs. The participation in Cluster Center programs was well balanced ethnically due in great measure to the control of student participation allowed by the design of the Cluster Centers. All Cluster Centers served elementary students. The large number of participants and the control over ethnic makeup indicate that secondary Cluster Centers should be considered.

Total participation in the Magnet School project was reported to be 31,753 students. The ethnic makeup of the total student participation in the Magnet School Project is presented in Table X.

Table X

Number and Percent,
By Ethnic Group, of Student Participation in Magnet Schools

	Number	Percent
Black	11,861	37.4%
Mexican-American	8,672	27.3%
Other	11,220	35.3%
TOTAL	31,753	100.0%

Data presented in Table X indicate that the Magnet School project was successful in establishing tri-ethnic student enrollment. Planned revision, replacement, relocation, and expansion of Magnet School programs for 1976-77 hold promise for more student participation which is more reflective of District ethnic makeup goals.

The fourth action step delineated in the District Court decree of July 11, 1975, may be summarized in the following manner:

> Report student enrollment and teacher assignment by ethnic group in each Magnet School biannually.

Student enrollment in each Magnet School is displayed in Table XI.

Table XI

Final Student Enrollment

By Magnet School

Magnet School Elementary	Black Number	%	Mexican-American Number	%	Other Number	%	Total Number
Berry	303	36.1	277	33.0	259	30.9	839
Bruce	471	87.0	51	9.4	20	3.6	542
Burrus	104	64.6	20	12.4	37	23.0	161
Garden Villas	319	45.0	113	16.0	280	39.0	712
Anson Jones (Bilingual)	6	7.2	30	36.2	47	56.6	83
Lantrip	34	34.5	27	27.3	38	38.4	99
Looscan	41	8.0	440	86.3	29	5.7	510
MacGregor	398	84.0	10	2.1	66	13.9	474
Parker	105	42.0	47	18.8	98	39.2	250
Pleasantville	48	40.0	24	20.0	49	40.0	121
Poe	215	41.3	21	4.0	284	54.7	520
Port Houston (Bilingual)	12	37.5	7	21.9	13	40.6	32
Pugh	41	5.3	659	85.7	69	9.0	769
River Oaks	71	34.0	35	17.0	101	49.0	207
Roosevelt	33	31.7	33	21.2	49	47.1	104
Ross	28	44.4	22	34.9	13	20.7	63
Scroggins	23	38.3	23	38.3	14	23.4	60
Wainwright	34	37.4	20	21.9	37	40.7	91
Elementary Totals	2286	40.6	1848	32.8	1503	26.7	5637

Junior High	Number	%	Number	%	Number	%	Number
Hamilton	56	35.0	35	22.0	68	43.0	158
Lanier	138	30.0	51	11.0	272	59.0	461
Terrell	62	83.8	6	8.1	6	8.1	74
Junior High Totals	256	36.9	92	13.3	346	49.9	694

Table XI

Final Student Enrollment

By Magnet School
(continued)

Magnet School High Schools	Black Number	%	Mexican-American Number	%	Other Number	%	Total Number
Bellaire	12	15.6	13	16.9	52	67.5	77
CLC	201	37.7	81	15.2	251	47.1	533
Jeff Davis	9	25.0	20	56.0	7	17.0	36
Milby	14	58.3	4	16.7	6	25.0	24
Reagan	247	21.7	403	35.4	488	42.8	1138
Sterling	20	51.0	2	5.0	17	44.0	39
B.T. Washington	64	76.2	6	7.1	14	16.7	84
High School Totals	567	29.4	529	27.4	835	43.2	1931
Cluster Centers							
Briargrove	665	37.2	372	20.8	751	42.0	1788
Anson Jones	3240	33.3	3240	33.3	3240	33.3	9720
Outdoor Education	2996	41.0	1623	22.0	2760	37.0	7379
Port Houston	930	40.0	493	21.0	892	39.0	2315
Sinclair	921	40.0	475	21.0	893	39.0	2289
Cluster Centers Totals	8752	37.3	6203	26.4	8536	36.3	23491
Magnet School Project Totals	11861	37.4	8672	27.3	11220	35.3	31753

The fourth court action step called not only for the reporting of Magnet School student enrollment, but also for reporting of Magnet School teacher assignment. A survey of teacher assignment, by ethnic group, in Magnet Schools was conducted during the week of May 10 - 14, 1976. The expressed goal of the Magnet School project was to provide quality integrated education. Such a goal implied that the faculty would also be ethnically balanced. This was not found to be the case. The ethnic makeup of the Magnet School project teaching and coordinating staff is displayed in Tables XII, XIII, XIV, and XV below:

Table XII

Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff
Elementary Magnet Schools (N=18)

	Black		Mexican-American		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teachers	45	31.9	21	14.9	75	53.2
Coordinators	5	31.3	2	12.5	9	56.2
Total	50	31.8	24	14.6	84	53.5

Table XIII

Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff
Junior High Magnet Schools (N=3)

	Black		Mexican-American		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teachers	8	25	1	3.1	23	71.9
Coordinators	3	100	0	0	0	0
Total	11	31.4	1	2.9	23	65.7

Table XIV

Ethnic Makeup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff
Senior High Magnet Schools (N=8)

	Black		Mexican-American		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teachers	17	28.8	5	8.5	37	62.7
Coordinators	1	14.3	0	0	6	85.7
Total	18	27.3	5	7.6	43	65.2

Table XV

Ethnic Makup of Teaching and Coordinating Staff
Magnet School Cluster Centers (N=5)

	Black		Mexican-American		Other	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Teachers	6	33.3	3	16.7	9	50.0
Coordinators	1	12.5	0	0	7*	87.5
Total	7	26.9	3	11.6	16	61.5

*Each Outdoor Education Camp has one coordinator.

The data presented in the preceding four tables indicate that there was an imbalance in Magnet School staffing. Over one-half of the total Magnet School instructional and coordinating staff (166 of 285 or 58.2%) were of an ethnic group other than Black or Mexican-American. The situation was most obvious at the junior high school level where 71.9% of the teachers (23 of 32) were classified as "Other" in ethnic group and in the Cluster Centers where 87.5% of instructional coordinators were classified as "Other." While staffing patterns in the Magnet Schools project were not ethnically isolated,

they were at less than desirable levels. The staffing ratios were brought to the attention of the appropriate administrators and will be considered in Phase II Magnet Schools project expansion.

The four court-defined action steps were met during Phase I of the Magnet Schools project. It is apparent from the data presented that the Magnet Schools project brought about a reduction in the number of ethnically isolated schools and in the number of students attending ethnically isolated schools. In addition, improved free transportation for Magnet School transfer students and ethnically balanced alternative programs were provided.

The court-defined action steps do not speak to the quality of the instructional program at any Magnet School. The instructional program was defined in performance objectives which were approved by the Board of Trustees as appropriate and valid objectives. The specific objectives of each program and the degree to which the objectives were met are discussed in the internal evaluation reports of the individual Magnet School programs. A brief discussion of the number of objectives proposed, accomplished, and specific problems encountered lends insight into the project as a whole.

Atotal of 232 performance objectives were proposed and approved for the 34 Phase I Magnet School programs. The number of objectives for any single Magnet School program ranged from a low of 2 objectives (4 programs) to 33 objectives at one elementary school. The average number of objectives for any program was approximately 6 objectives. Most programs included objectives in the areas of enrollment, academic achievement, parent/community involvement, and attitudes toward the Magnet program. The number of objectives proposed and met by each Magnet School program are presented in Table XVI.

Examination of Table XVI reveals that the 32 Phase I Magnet School programs reported having met 189 of the total of 232 proposed program objectives. This represents accomplishment of 81.5% of the proposed objectives. The objectives not met centered in the areas of ethnic makeup of student enrollment and achievement of specific Magnet School program criteria (e.g. instrumental music technique, etc.). A summary of objectives met, by program level, is presented in Table XVII.

TABLE XVI

Number of Objectives Proposed and
Met by Each Magnet School Program

Elementary	Number of Objectives Proposed	Number of Objectives Met
Berry	10	10
Bruce	5	5
Burrus	33	22
Garden Villas	6	6
Anson Jones	2	0
Lantrip	16	16
Looscan	4	2
MacGregor	5	4
Parker	4	4
Pleasantville	5	5
Poe	8	6
Port Houston (Bilingual)	2	1
Pugh	26	17
River Oaks	8	8
Roosevelt	4	4
Ross	5	5
Scroggins	7	6
Wainwright	4	3
Elementary Total	157	124

TABLE XVI
(Continued)

Junior High	Number of Objectives Proposed	Number of Objectives Met
Hamilton	5	2
Lanier	6	6
Terrell	5	3
Junior High Totals	16	11
High Schools		
Bellaire	6	5
CLC	3	2
Jeff Davis	2	1
Milby	3	1
Reagan	4	3
Sterling	10	9
B. T. Washington	10	9
Senior High Totals	38	30
Cluster Centers		
Briargrove	9	9
Outdoor Education	7	7
People Place	3	3
Port Houston	2	2
Sinclair	9	9
Cluster Center Totals	24	24
Magnet School Project Total	232	189

Table XVII

Number and Percent of Objectives Proposed and Achieved
By Magnet School Program Level

	Objectives Proposed	Objectives Achieved	Percent Achieved
Elementary	154	124	80.5%
Junior High	16	11	68.8%
Senior High	38	30	78.9%
Cluster Centers	24	24	100.0%
TOTAL	232	189	81.5%

Data in Table XVII reveals that only junior high level Magnet School programs fell below 70% accomplishment of proposed objectives. As was shown in preceding sections of this report, the limited scope and small number of programs at the junior high level may have affected the degree of overall success enjoyed by programs at this level. Data in Table XVII also reveal that Cluster Centers reported having accomplished 100% of their proposed objectives. This kind of success is another indicator that establishment of Cluster Centers at other school levels warrants consideration.

A total of 43 objectives were reported as not achieved by the several Magnet School programs. Of these 43 objectives, measurement problems prevented determination of the degree of success in meeting eight objectives. These eight objectives included three objectives dealing with mathematics achievement as determined by the BASE tests. The BASE was given in the fall, but was not available for post-testing in the spring. Accomplishment of two objectives at the high school level dealing with academic achievement was not determined because test scoring was not completed by Region IV. Another high school objective is a third year objective and thus was not appropriate for this year. Taking the number of objectives having measurement problems into account, only 35 objectives were not achieved. This represents 15% of the total of 232 proposed objectives. Overall, the Magnet School project was very successful in meeting the various program objectives proposed.

Throughout the 1975-76 school year, four general problems were reported by the several Magnet School programs. Support for curriculum development, transportation, recruitment, and acquisition of approved materials were the problems most often cited by Magnet School project personnel. Many programs were hard pressed to stay ahead of their students in curriculum development. Requests were made by at least five programs that instructional coordinators be full time rather than part-time for curriculum development. The problem of lack of support for curriculum development may be the most critical problem in the Magnet School project over the long run.

Transportation was a continuing problem during the 1975-76 school year. The nature of the problem evolved through the year from one of being able to provide transportation to all magnet students requesting it to problems with specific routes or bus drivers. Early in the school year, the District did not have enough transportation units to provide transportation to all eligible students. After more units were placed into service, transportation problems became more specific in nature. A single facet of this problem was reported throughout the school year: the need for intermediate stops along the established bus routes. Many children had to walk 10 blocks or more to bus pick-up points. This was considered by parents to be excessive for most elementary students.

Recruitment difficulties were reported by most Magnet School programs during the 1975-76 school year. The most serious aspect of this problem was the apathy or, as often reported, hostility with which Magnet School personnel were greeted by possible sending school personnel. Sending schools were reported as having actively discouraged possible Magnet School program participants from enrolling.

The final general problem reported by Magnet School programs was the delay in approval and receipt of necessary program materials. Delays of up to four weeks between requisition of materials and approval were reported. When the reported delays were added to the time of delivery, many materials necessary for full program implementation were not received until the spring. Another aspect of this problem that was reported by at least

three programs was the alteration of requisitions for materials. Such alteration, on at least two occasions, resulted in the purchase of materials or equipment which were inappropriate for the use for which the materials or equipment were intended. The four general problem areas have been addressed in earlier reports and action to correct the problems has been reported.

SUMMARY

The goal of the Magnet School project was to provide alternative educational programs of high quality which would attract an ethnic cross section of students. Data reported by the individual Magnet School programs, and substantiated by the Corporation for Research and Engineering in Education (CREED), indicated that the Magnet School project was successful in accomplishing its goal. Thirty-four alternative programs were established in Phase I of the Magnet School project. The thirty-four programs represented all grade levels, K - 12, and ranged from fine arts programs to fundamental academic programs and programs for the academically able.

The Phase I Magnet School programs were able to achieve 81.5% of their 232 objectives. This attainment speaks well of the quality of education made available. The quality of the Magnet School programs was evident to all who visited them.

A total of 31,753 boys and girls participated in the programs in an ethnic ratio of 37.4% Black, 27.3% Mexican-American, and 35.3% "Other." These data indicated the success of this project in providing quality education to a tri-ethnic student population.

Four general problem areas were reported: curriculum development, transportation, recruitment, and purchase of materials. The problems deterred THE Magnet Schools in their attempts to accomplish their proposed objectives. The problem in the area of curriculum may have the most severe deleterious effect over the long term. Each of the four general problem areas had some administrative action taken to correct its adverse effects. These problems should not carry over into Phase II.

The Magnet School project, along with other District projects, has resulted in a reduction in the number of ethnically isolated schools in the Houston Independent School District. The number of students attending ethnically isolated schools has been reduced. Students attending Magnet School programs have been provided free, though not always convenient, transportation to school and home again. Students attending Magnet School

programs represent a tri-ethnic cross section of students in the District. The Magnet School project instructional staff was fairly well representative, ethnically, of the instructional staff of the District as a whole.

Expansion of the Magnet School project and relocation and refinement of existing programs in Phase II will offer more students an opportunity to participate in what is an innovative, exciting, and successful program.